

Applicant has substantially revised claims, particularly claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, as set out above. At the end of each element of revised claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, parenthetically inserted is a reference to corresponding structure in the original application which supports the claim. These parenthetical insertions will be deleted prior to issuance, and are not intended to limit the scope of the claims. The corresponding method claims are not so labelled, but similar correlation should be apparent.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13 remain pending, as amended. Each of the Examiner's objections and rejections is addressed below.

Objection to the Drawings Under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a)

Applicant has substantially revised claim 1 as set out above. The element objected to by the Examiner in claim 1 is no longer included in the claims, rather it is replaced by "tag storage", which, in the embodiment described, is included with the video storage device, or stored in tables in the computer 100. Also, claim 7 has been amended to remove the offending language.

Also, the means for accessing frames of video data in claims 2, 6, and 8 has been removed from the claim in favor of an apparatus or step which displays the frames, such as the video monitor in the figure.

Other objections to the drawings are believed addressed by the amendments to the claims as set out above. Accordingly, reconsideration of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Objection to Specification and Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

In view of the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has substantially amended the claims as set out above. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested. As mentioned above, the structure in the specification which corresponds to the claimed elements is set out at the end of each element in the apparatus claims. Therefore, it is submitted that the specification supports the claims as amended and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Again, Applicant has amended the claims substantially to address the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of such claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Naimark, et al.

Applicant traverses the rejection as applied to the claims as amended and reconsideration is requested. The Naimark system is a manually compiled video system. The present invention differs substantially in that it includes processing resources which assemble the content video image, and logic executed by those processing resources which associates positions in the content video images with addresses of storage locations for the frames of video. The Naimark system does not suggest or show such apparatus. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 3, 6, 10, and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, 10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Morgan.

As mentioned above, the claims have been substantially amended to clarify the statement of the invention and to distinguish over the references.

Applicant points out that there is no structure in Morgan corresponding to the controllable video image generator, which is responsive to control signals generated in response to a content video image, as recited in the claims as amended.

Apparently, the Examiner's rejection was based on a misunderstanding of the invention as recited in the original claims. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Morgan in view of the Toshiba publication. Reconsideration is

respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the comments above.

The combination of references cited by the Examiner does not yield the present invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the substantial amendments made herein, complete reexamination of the present application is respectfully requested. It is submitted that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 16, 1994

By: Mark A. Haynes
Mark A. Haynes
Registration No. 30,846

HAYNES & DAVIS
2180 Sand Hill Road, Suite 170
Menlo Park, California 94025-6935
Telephone: (415) 233-0188